



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,702	09/23/2003	Keng-Chu Lin	24061.22	2195
42717	7590	05/15/2009	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP			GEBREMARIAM, SAMUEL A.	
IP Section			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2323 Victory Avenue				2811
Suite 700				
Dallas, TX 75219				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/15/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/668,702	Applicant(s) LIN ET AL.
	Examiner SAMUEL A. GEBREMARIAM	Art Unit 2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17,21 and 24-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17,21 and 24-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1449B)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al., US 6,472,306 in view of Lee (512) et al., US 6,649,512 and in further view of Yamaguchi JP 59182284.

Regarding claim 1, Lee teaches (figs. 9-16) a method of forming a semiconductor device having a first layer (102) underlying a second layer (132), the method comprising: forming a glue layer (104) directly on the first layer (102), wherein the first layer is metal layer (copper metal lines); and depositing the second layer (132) directly onto the upper surface of the first layer (102) and the second layer is a metal layer (copper).

Lee does not explicitly teach performing an inter-treatment on the glue layer, wherein the inter-treatment affects the upper and lower surfaces of the glue layer and

improves an adhesive interface between the glue layer and the first layer and wherein the inter-treatment includes applying a plasma and electron beam and wherein the inter-treated glue layer improves adhesion between the first and second layers.

Lee (512) teaches performing an inter-treatment on a glue/sealing layer (fig. 2b), wherein the inter-treatment affects the upper and lower surfaces of the glue layer and improves an adhesive interface between the glue layer and the first layer (col. 3, lines 28-40, Lee teaches that the plasma treatment improves adhesion between the low-k film and the sealing layer) and wherein the inter-treatment includes applying a plasma (col. 3, lines 5-15).

Yamaguchi teaches (refer to the abstract) electron beam irradiation of silicon nitride layer improves adhesion of silicon nitride layer to metal or metal oxide.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the process of performing an inter-treatment on the glue layer/sealing layer as taught by Lee (512) in the process of Lee in order to improve the adhesion between the low-k dielectric layer and the glue/sealing layer. Since the combined process of Lee and Lee (512) teaches the same process as the claimed invention, the modified process teaches that the inter-treatment affects the upper and lower surfaces of the glue layer and this in turn improves an adhesive interface between the first layer and the second layer layer. The modified process also teaches depositing the second layer directly onto the upper surface of the inter-treated glue layer.

Furthermore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the electron beam treatment of the silicon

nitride layer as taught by Yamaguchi in the combined process of Lee in order to further improve the adhesion of silicon nitride layer to the metal.

The limitations of “a method for increasing a time dependent dielectric breakdown lifetime of a semiconductor device” is not given patentable weight because a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Furthermore since Lee as modified by Yamaguchi teaches the same as the claimed invention, the modified process is inherently capable of increasing a time dependent dielectric breakdown lifetime of the semiconductor device.

Regarding claim 3, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claim 1 above including the inter-treatment on the glue layer includes applying plasma to the glue layer (fig. 2b of Lee 512 and accompanying text).

Regarding claim 4, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claim 1 above including selecting a reacting gas, a process time, a process temperature, a process pressure, and a reacting gas flow (refer to col. 3, lines 5-15, Lee (512)).

Regarding claim 5, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claim 1 above including the selected reacting gas is a hydrogen-based gas (refer to col. 3, lines 5-15, Lee (512)).

Regarding claim 6, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claims 1 and 4 above including the selected reacting gas is a helium-based gas (generally plasma treatment includes providing an inert gas such helium in the processing chamber, therefore Lee teaches a helium-based gas).

Regarding claim 7, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claims 1 and 4 above except explicitly stating that the selected process time is between approximately 1 and 100 seconds, the selected process temperature is between approximately 200 and 400° C, the selected process pressure is between approximately 0.5 and 10 torr. Lee (512) teaches the selected reacting gas flow is between approximately 100 and 2500 sccm (col. 3, lines 5-15).

Parameters such as process time, temperature and pressure are subject to routine experimentation and optimization to achieve the optimum device characteristics during fabrication.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the process time, the temperature range and pressure as claimed in the process of Lee in order to form a high quality glue layer.

Regarding claim 8, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claim 1 above including performing the inter-treatment on the glue layer includes directing an electron beam towards the glue layer (Yamaguchi).

Regarding claim 9, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claims 1 and 8 above including directing the electron beam towards the glue layer

further comprises defining a process power and a dosage (electron beam process requires power and electron beam energy).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claims 1 and 8 above except explicitly stating that that the process power is between approximately 1000 eV and 8000 eV and the dosage is between approximately 50 and 500 $\mu\text{C}/\text{cm}^2$.

Parameters such as process power and dosage are subject to routine experimentation and optimization to achieve the desired device characteristics during fabrication.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made adjust the process power and dosage as claimed in the process of Lee in order to form a high quality glue layer.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, Lee (512), Yamaguchi and in further view of Yu et al., US 6,764,952.

Regarding claim 2, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claim 1 above except explicitly stating performing a pre-treatment on the first layer before forming the glue layer.

Yu teaches (fig. 1) a pre-treatment on the first layer before forming the glue layer in order to retard copper diffusion and improve adhesion of copper diffusion layer on the copper surface (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the pre-treatment on the first layer before forming the glue layer as taught by Yu in the combined process of Lee, Lee (512) and Yamaguchi in order to retard copper diffusion and improve adhesion of copper diffusion layer on the copper surface.

5. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al., US 6,472,306 in view of Lee (512) et al., US 6,649,512.

Regarding claims 12, Lee teaches depositing a dielectric layer (refer to col. 4, lines 9-16); depositing a first metal layer (102) on the dielectric layer; depositing a glue layer (104) on the dielectric layer (fig. 9) and the first metal layer (102) such that an interface is formed directly between the first metal layer (102) and a lower surface of the glue layer (104) and an interface is formed directly between the dielectric layer (fig. 9) and a lower surface of the glue layer (104); forming a second metal layer (132) directly on the upper surface of the glue layer (104, refer to fig. 16).

Lee does not explicitly teach electing at least one of a plasma treatment process and an electron beam treatment process; applying the selected treatment process to affect the upper and lower surfaces of the glue layer; wherein the treatment process enhances adhesiveness between the dielectric layer and the second metal layer.

Lee (512) teaches performing an inter-treatment on a glue/sealing layer (fig. 2b), wherein the inter-treatment affects the upper and lower surfaces of the glue layer and improves an adhesive interface between the glue layer and the first layer (col. 3, lines

28-40, Lee (512) teaches that the plasma treatment improves adhesion between the low-k film and the sealing layer) and wherein the inter-treatment includes applying a plasma (col. 3, lines 5-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the process of performing an inter-treatment on the glue layer/sealing layer as taught by Lee (512) in the process of Lee in order to improve the adhesion between the low-k dielectric layer and the glue/sealing layer. Since the combined process of Lee and Lee (512) teaches the same as the claimed process, the modified process teaches that the inter-treatment affects the upper and lower surfaces of the glue layer and this in turn improves an adhesive interface between the first layer and the second layer. The modified process also teaches forming the second metal layer directly onto the upper surface of the glue layer.

Since the combined process of Lee and Lee (512) is the same as the claimed process, Lee as modified by Lee (512) teaches the treatment process enhances adhesiveness between the dielectric layer and the second metal layer.

The limitations of "a method for increasing a time dependent dielectric breakdown lifetime of a semiconductor device" is not given patentable weight because a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the

prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Furthermore since Lee as modified by Tu teaches the same claimed process, the modified process is inherently capable of increasing a time dependent dielectric breakdown lifetime of the semiconductor device.

Regarding claim 13, Lee teaches the entire claimed process of claim 1 above including the glue layer (104) with a certain thickness.

The limitation "the selected thickness is based at least partially on a desired electrical property of the glue layer" is not given patentable weight because the feature does not add anything to the process of forming the glue layer. Furthermore since Lee is concerned with forming interconnection structure therefore Lee's process is inherently concerned with finding the desired electrical property of the glue layer.

Regarding claim 14, Lee as modified by Lee (512) teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claim 1 above including adjusting a property of the selected treatment process based on the selected thickness of the glue layer.

Lee teaches forming the treatment over a certain depth of the glue layer. Lee as modified by Lee (512) is inherently capable of adjusting a property of the selected treatment process based on the selected thickness of the glue layer.

Regarding claim 15, Lee teaches substantially the entire claimed process of claims 1 and 14 above except explicitly stating the duration of the selected treatment process.

Parameters such as process time are subject to routine experimentation and optimization to achieve the desired film quality during device fabrication.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the process time as claimed in the process of Lee in order to form a high quality glue layer.

Regarding claim 16, Lee teaches the entire claimed process of claim 12 above including the glue layer is SiN (104).

Regarding claim 17, Lee teaches the entire claimed process of claim 12 above including the selected process is the plasma treatment process, and wherein a reacting gas to be used in the plasma treatment process is hydrogen based gas (refer to col. 3, lines 5-15, Lee (512)).

6. Claims 21 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Lee (512).

Regarding claim 21, Lee teaches (figs. 9-16) forming a dielectric layer (refer to col. 4, lines 9-16); forming a first metal layer (102) adjacent the dielectric layer (fig. 9); forming a glue/sealing layer (104) on the first metal layer (104) such that a first interface is formed directly between metal of the first metal layer (102) and a lower surface of the glue layer (104) and a second interface is formed directly between the dielectric layer (100) and a lower surface of the glue layer (104); and forming a second metal layer (132) on the upper surface of the glue layer (104) such that a third interface is formed directly between metal of the second metal layer (132) and the upper surface of the glue layer (104), and wherein the third interface overlies the first interface and second interface (fig. 16).

Lee does not explicitly teach performing an inter-treatment on the glue layer to alter upper and lower surfaces of the glue layer for improved adhesiveness, wherein the performing the inter-treatment includes using at least one of a plasma and an electron beam.

Lee (512) teaches a plasma treatment process (fig. 2b) and applying the selected treatment process to alter the upper and lower surfaces of the silicon nitride layer (206a, col. 3, lines 5-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the plasma treatment process taught by Lee (512) in the process of Lee in order to improve the adhesion between the low-k dielectric layer and the glue/sealing layer.

Since the combined process of Lee and Lee (512) is the same as the claimed process, Lee as modified by Lee (512) teaches the treatment process enhances adhesiveness between the dielectric layer and the second metal layer.

The limitations of "a method for improving an interface in a semiconductor device" is not given patentable weight because a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Furthermore since Lee

Art Unit: 2811

as modified by Lee (512) teaches the same process as the claimed invention, the modified process is inherently capable of improving an interface in a semiconductor device.

Regarding claim 24, Lee substantially teaches the entire claimed process of claim 21 above including the glue layer SiN (104).

Regarding claim 25, Lee teaches (figs. 9-16) forming a first metal layer (102); forming a glue layer (104) directly on the first metal layer (102), wherein the glue layer is an etch stop layer and includes silicon (layer 104 is formed of silicon nitride); and forming a second metal layer (132) directly on the upper surface of the glue layer (104).

Lee does not explicitly teach performing an inter-treatment on the glue layer to alter upper and lower surfaces of the glue layer for improved adhesiveness wherein the inter-treatment includes using plasma.

Lee (512) teaches a plasma treatment process (fig. 2b) and applying the selected treatment process to affect the upper and lower surfaces of the silicon nitride layer (206a, col. 3, lines 5-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the plasma treatment process taught by Lee (512) in the process of Lee in order to improve the adhesion between the low-k dielectric layer and the glue/sealing layer.

Since the combined process of Lee and Lee (512) is the same as the claimed invention, Lee as modified by Lee (512) teaches the inter-treatment on the glue layer

alters the upper and lower surface of the glue layer; the second metal layer is formed directly on the altered upper surface of the glue layer and improves adhesiveness.

The limitations of “a method for improving an interface in a semiconductor device” is not given patentable weight because a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

7. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Lee (512) and in further view of Yamaguchi.

Regarding claim 26, Lee substantially teaches the entire claimed process of claim 25 above except explicitly stating that the inter-treatment included using the electron beam.

Yamaguchi teaches (refer to the abstract) electron beam irradiation of silicon nitride layer improves adhesion of silicon nitride layer to metal or metal oxide.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the electron beam treatment of the silicon nitride layer as taught by Yamaguchi in the combined process of Lee in order to further improve the adhesion of silicon nitride layer to the metal.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 27, Lee substantially teaches the entire claimed process of claims 25 and 26 above including the inter-treatment includes using the plasma and the electron beam process.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17, 21 and 24-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LYNNE A. GURLEY whose telephone number is (571)272-1670. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne A. Gurley can be reached on 571-272-1670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Samuel A Gebremariam/

Examiner, Art Unit 2811

/SAG/

May 12, 2009